UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,715	05/04/2001	Bilhan Kirbas	42252-1003	9648

32968 7590 07/14/2005

KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.
P.O. BOX 928289
SAN DIEGO, CA 92192-8289

EXAMINER	
DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2686	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/849,715	KIRBAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Willie J. Daniel, Jr.	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 08 April 2005. **Claims 21-40** are now pending in the present application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 April 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24, 33, and **37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding **Claim 24**, the claim recites "...a member of a set of phone numbers within an area code...". The specification supports and distinguishes between authorized locations

and unauthorized locations and not an authorized location containing an unauthorized location (see pg. 6, line 17 - pg. 7, line 1). The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to provide supportive comments and page(s), line(s), and/or drawing(s) that support the claimed features of the instant application to help resolve the current issue(s). The limitation appears to be similar to 112 rejection relating to "sets of partial numbers" in final action mailed 08 December 2004.

Regarding **Claim 33**, the claim recites "...wherein the plurality of authorized locations comprises a plurality of unauthorized locations...". The specification supports and distinguishes between authorized locations and unauthorized locations and not an authorized location containing an unauthorized location (see pg. 6, lines 17-20; pg. 10, lines 8-10; Figs. 1, 3). The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to provide the page(s), line(s), and/or drawing(s) that support the claimed features of the instant application to help resolve the current issue(s).

Regarding **Claim 37**, the claim recites "...a first storage area for storing at least one authorized geographic characteristic..." and "... a second storage area for storing at least one authorized location...". The specification supports a memory (130) with section (310) including instructions and section (320) including a database list of unauthorized and/or authorized geographic characteristics (e.g., unauthorized and/or authorized area codes) (see pg. 6, lines 17-20; pg. 8, lines 10-20; Figs. 1, 3). The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to provide the page(s), line(s), and/or drawing(s) that support the claimed features of the instant application to help resolve the current issue(s).

4. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive. The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to review all claims and specification to clarify current issues as well as any other issues.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 27-28 and **37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the comparison result" in line 5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the comparison result" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "...the results...the comparison..." in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding **Claim 27-28**, the claims recite "the comparison result" which is not claimed previously in the claims or in the independent claim 26. The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to correct and/or clarify the issues.

Regarding **Claim 37**, the claims recite "...the results...the comparison..." which is not claimed previously in the claim. The Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to correct and/or clarify the issues.

6. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive.

Claim Objections

7. **Claim 25** is objected to because of the following informalities:

   a. **Claim 25** recites "the method of claim 20" which indicates claim 25 is dependent on claim 20. The applicant admits to canceling claim 20 on pg. 2, 2nd paragraph. The Examiner interprets claim 25 as being dependent on claim 21.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 21 and **30** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)**.

Regarding **Claim 21**, Irvin a method for restricting communication in a mobile communication terminal (100) which reads on the claimed "wireless communications device" (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) functional device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 "ref. 440");

inputting a phone number into the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28), where the user uses the keypad (108) to dial numbers;

utilizing a control unit (102) which reads on the claimed "controller" in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zone) pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 6, lines 1-18,33-37; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

placing a phone call to the inputted phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the placing of a call would be inherent for the dialing of a number.

Regarding **Claim 30**, Irvin a device (100) for restricting wireless communication (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising:

a global positioning system (GPS) enabled device (160) for determining a physical location of the device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 "ref. 440");

a keypad (108) which reads on the claimed "user interface" for inputting a phone number into the device (100) (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; Fig. 2), where the user dials numbers via the keypad (108);

a memory (170) for pre-storing a plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see Fig. 2);

a controller (102) connected to the GPS enabled device (160), the user interface (108) and the memory (150), the controller (102) for determining if the determined physical

location matches an authorized location of the plurality of authorized locations, the controller (102) outputting an indication of a match (see col. 6, lines 1-18,33-37; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

a transmitter (120) / receiver (140) which reads on the claimed "wireless communication circuit" connected to the controller (102) for initiating a phone call to the inputted phone number only if the controller (102) outputs the indication of the match (see col. 4, lines 11-28; col. 3, lines 39-42; Figs. 2, 4 "ref. 470"), where the user dials a number in which the location is checked to determine if the user is in a safe zone and whether or not to apply security measures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Kaplan (US 5,884,193)**.

Regarding **Claim 22**, Irvin discloses the feature wherein the step of placing a phone call comprises the step of:

placing the phone call to the inputted phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location (e.g., safe zone) of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42), where the phone is determined to be in a

safe zone in which the placing of a call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics. However, the examiner maintains that the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the features

determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 5, lines 21-33; col. 6, lines 10-11; col. 6, line 67 - col. 7, line 2; col. 7, lines 64-66; col. 3, line 36-46; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the system can store in the storage areas (e.g., ref. "130" "128") numbers such as telephone numbers (i.e., telephone numbers are mapped to an area code or particular

geographic area) and/or area code (e.g., 800 numbers or 900 numbers) which are used for allowing/prohibiting calls (e.g., long distance);

utilizing the controller (102) for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory (130) of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 5, lines 14-18, 21-33; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the CPU (102) of the wireless communication (100) compares the entered and stored numbers for matching; and

when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 21-33; col. 6, lines 10-11; col. 6, line 67 - col. 7, line 2; col. 7, lines 64-66; col. 3, line 36-46; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the system can store in the storage areas (e.g., ref. "130" "128") numbers such as telephone numbers (i.e., telephone numbers are mapped to an area code or particular geographic area) and/or area code (e.g., 800 numbers or 900 numbers) which are used for allowing/prohibiting calls (e.g., long distance).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Kaplan to have the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic

characteristics, in order to provide various levels of call restriction that can be selected by the user and implemented within the wireless communication device itself, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 3, lines 31-34, 42-45).

Regarding **Claim 23**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

Kaplan further discloses the features

wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-11; Figs. 2 and 5B), and

wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-17; Figs. 2 and 5B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Kaplan to have the feature s wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes, in order to provide various levels of call restriction that can be selected by the user and implemented within the wireless communication device itself, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 3, lines 31-34, 42-45).

Regarding **Claim 24**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises a member of a set of phone numbers within an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of sets of phone numbers within area codes. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises a member of a set of phone numbers within an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of sets of phone numbers within area codes was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

Kaplan further discloses the features

wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises a member of a set of phone numbers within an area code (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-11; Figs. 2 and 5B), where the system (100) restricts calls to telephone numbers in which a member of a set of phone numbers would be inherent, and

wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of sets of phone numbers within area codes (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-17; Figs. 2 and 5B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Kaplan to have the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises a member of a set of phone numbers within an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of sets of phone numbers within area codes, in order to provide various levels of call restriction that can be selected by the user and implemented

within the wireless communication device itself, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 3, lines 31-34, 42-45).

Claims 25-29 and **31-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Rahikainen et al**. (hereinafter Rahikainen) **(US 6,085,080 B1)**.

Regarding **Claim 25**, Irvin discloses the feature when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

In the same field of endeavor, Rahikainen discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B "ref. 14a"), where the WLL station (1) checks the incoming call against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Irvin a method for restricting communication in a wireless communications device (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) capable device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 "ref. 440");

utilizing a controller (102) in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100); and

when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B "ref. 14a"), where the WLL station (1) checks the incoming call against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 27**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features comparing at least a portion of an inputted phone number to a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match. However, the examiner maintains that the features comparing at least a portion of an inputted phone number to a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features

comparing at least a portion of an inputted phone number to a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory (11b) of the wireless communications device (1); and

initiating a phone call (e.g., outgoing call) to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B "ref. 14a"), where comparator (14b) the WLL station (1) checks the outgoing/incoming calls against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features comparing at least a portion of an inputted phone number to a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match, in order to provide a flexible method of

restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 28**, Irvin discloses the feature and if the determined physical location matches one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the initiating of a phone call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match. However, the examiner maintains that the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature initiating a phone call (e.g., outgoing call) to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B "ref. 14a"), where comparator (14b) the WLL station (1) checks the outgoing/incoming calls against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the comparison results in a match, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 29**, Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B "ref. 14a"), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 31**, Irvin discloses having the feature and outputs the indication of the match only if the determined physical location matches the authorized location (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone

number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory (11b) (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number;

wherein the processor (11a) which reads on the claimed "controller" determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the telephone number is compared against the lists; and

wherein the controller (11a) compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where controller (11a) processes data according to the comparator function (14a), and

if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 32**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code

of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks the telephone number and for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 33**, the combination of Irvin and Rahikainen discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 31), in addition Irvin further discloses the device of claim 31,

wherein the plurality of authorized locations (e.g. safe zones) comprises a plurality of unauthorized locations (see col. 4, lines 11-28; col. 3, lines 39-42; Figs. 2, 4 "ref. 470"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

wherein the controller (102) determines if the determined physical location matches an unauthorized location of the plurality of unauthorized locations, the controller (102) outputting an indication of an unauthorized match (see col. 4, lines 11-28; col. 3, lines 39-42; Figs. 2, 4 "ref. 470"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

wherein the wireless communication circuit (120/140) connected to the controller (102) initiates a phone call to the inputted phone number unless the controller (102) outputs the indication of the unauthorized match (see col. 4, lines 11-28; col. 3, lines 39-42; Figs. 2, 4 "ref. 470"), where the user dials a number in which the location is checked to determine if the user is in a safe zone and whether or not to apply security measures.

Regarding **Claim 34**, Irvin discloses a wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2), comprising:

a storage means (170) for storing a plurality of authorized locations, and a plurality of unauthorized locations (see Fig. 2), the device (100) can store position information. As a note, the teaches of seeing dialed digits (see col. 3, lines 37-42; col. 4, lines 11-28), where the device (100) can dial telephone numbers in which a common feature of phones is to store telephone numbers in a memory such as an address book;

an input means (108) for inputting a phone number into the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2);

a global positioning system (GPS) means (160) for determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2);

the controller means (102) further determining if the determined physical location matches an authorized location (e.g., safe zones) of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) or an unauthorized location of the plurality of unauthorized locations, the controller means (102) for outputting a location match signal (see Figs. 2 and 4);

wireless communication circuit means (120/140) for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal and the outputted location match signal. Irvin fails to disclose having the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes; a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal. However, the examiner maintains that the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes, a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features

a storage means (11b) for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B),

a controller means (11a) for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means (11a) for outputting an area code match signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B);

RF component (11f) which reads on the claimed "wireless communication circuit means" for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes, a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 35**, Irvin discloses the feature and the outputted location match signal indicates an authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see Fig. 4). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the placing of a phone call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 36**, Irvin discloses the feature or the outputted location match signal indicates an unauthorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see Fig. 4). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the user dials a number in which the location is checked to determine if the user is in a safe

zone and whether or not to apply security measures. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the phone call is blocked if the outputted area code match signal indicates an unauthorized area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 37**, Irvin discloses a mobile communication system (10) which reads on the claimed "wireless communication network" for restricting communication of a wireless communications device (100), the wireless communication network (10) (see col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 5; Figs. 1-4), where the system can activate and deactivate security features comprising:

a mobile communication system (10) which reads on the claimed "cellular service network" for accepting a phone call placed by the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 5; Figs. 1-4); and

the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2) comprising:

a first storage area (170) for storing at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) the location (e.g., safe zone), where the storage area being a first would be inherent. Also, the device includes an additional memory (150);

a second storage area (170) for storing at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) the location (e.g., safe zone) , where the storage area being a second would be inherent. Also, the device includes an additional memory (150);

an input device (108) for inputting a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; Fig. 2), where the user dials numbers via the keypad (108);

a global positioning system (GPS) function (160) for determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 "ref. 440");

for comparing the determined physical location to the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) the location (e.g., safe zone). Irvin fails to disclose having the features a processor for comparing the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic, and the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon the results of the comparisons; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal. However, the examiner maintains that the features a processor for comparing the inputted phone number to

the at least one authorized geographic characteristic, and the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon the results of the comparisons; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature a processor (11a) for comparing the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), and

the processor (11a) outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon the results of the comparisons (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B); and

a wireless communication circuit (11f) connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit (11f) for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor (11a) outputs the place call signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features a processor for comparing the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic, and the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon the results of the comparisons; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 38**, the combination of Irvin and Rahikainen discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 37), in addition Irvin further discloses the wireless communication network (10) of claim 37, wherein the wireless communication device (100) further comprises a receiver circuit (140) for receiving an incoming phone call from the cellular service network only if the determined physical location matches the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the control unit checks the location of the terminal (100) to determine if the user is in a safe zone and whether or not to apply security measures in which the receiver (140) receiving an incoming phone call would be inherent.

Regarding **Claim 39**, Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 40**, the combination of Irvin and Rahikainen discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 37), in addition Irvin further discloses

wherein the cellular service network (10) controls the storage of the at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., safe zone) and the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) utilizing an over the air storage instruction to the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 1-39).

Alternative - **Claims 25-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Agness et al**. (hereinafter Agness) **(US 6,799,052 B1)**.

Regarding **Claim 25**, Irvin discloses the feature when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Agness.

In the same field of endeavor, Agness discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 6, lines 21-25, 33-36; col. 8, lines 37-51; Fig. 2), where the cell phone (13) has a GPS circuit (45) for determining the position which is used to restrict calls that are directed to the cell phone (13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Agness to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a transmission inhibit for digital hand-held cell phones when at specified highway location and specified other restricted locations or during specified restricted times Agness (see col. 2, lines 38-41).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Irvin a method for restricting communication in a wireless communications device (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) capable device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 "ref. 440");

utilizing a controller (102) in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100); and

when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 "ref. 460"), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Agness.

Agness further discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 6, lines 21-25, 33-36; col. 8, lines 37-51; Fig. 2), where the cell phone (13) has a GPS circuit (45) for determining the position which is used to restrict calls that are directed to the cell phone (13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Agness to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a transmission inhibit for digital hand-

held cell phones when at specified highway location and specified other restricted locations or during specified restricted times Agness (see col. 2, lines 38-41).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willie J. Daniel, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marsha D Banks-Harold

MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

WJD,JR
11 July 2005